



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The fundamental necessity for teaching any language, let me repeat, is small classes, classes numbering not more than twenty-five or thirty at most. Every executive should be made to realize that every additional pupil over this number reduces the efficiency of the whole class, and that in a short time the pupil is not merely wasting his time, but is forming habits of idleness and inefficiency which will dog him throughout life. Better no education (!) at all than such a travesty on training. G. L.

A CHARACTERIZATION OF GALLIC LATIN¹

Professor Durham's paper on Classical and Vulgar Latin² will set forth the main facts and concepts implied in the term *sermo vulgaris*, the informal spoken Latin of the ancient Romans, as distinguished from the formal, written Latin of Roman Literature, and will show how Latin never ceased to be spoken, and how we may truthfully say that, in the main, French, Spanish and Italian are modern forms of a developed provincial Latin.

My own plan is to discuss briefly, in a more limited field, certain phenomena, with which an up-to-date teacher of Caesar can easily become acquainted, and by knowledge of which he can view in a more detached way the language and the content of the text, and so arrive at a broader understanding and perhaps a livelier interpretation. Caesar's Gallic War is a first glimpse, albeit an important glimpse, into a vista of language, literature and history, extending in unbroken sweep beyond a cultural as well as a geographic Rubicon³.

The brief characterization of Gallic Latin offered in this paper aims primarily to present to teachers and students of Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* certain facts and concepts, which, while familiar to some, are of vital importance for all. As most Latin teachers and some second year pupils have some knowledge of French, and as some pupils are about to begin French, it is not unreasonable to hope that, by stimulating the historic sense and fixing in the mind the concept of the continuity of linguistic tradition in Gaul, the teacher may awaken a new interest in Caesar the pioneer, the Roman people and the Latin language, and, to some degree, in the

incalculable influence of the ancient civilization on modern Europe.

As a teacher I believe that the powers of apprehension and comprehension of the young are vastly in advance of their powers of expression. I know that the great thrills in my own intellectual life have been caused by illuminating suggestions, apt comparisons, and clever but impromptu coordinating of isolated facts under general heads, that is to say, by the *obiter dicta* of the class-room, the by-product of the day's work. Teaching by indirection may sometimes be as effective as that by direct precept. However monotonous Caesar's narrative may become to the teacher through frequent repetition, the message comes to each new generation of pupils as a revelation, a revelation not merely that Latin is a real language in which it is possible to say something, but a revelation of important facts and relations. Teacher and taught become pioneers, discoverers. As they thread their way with Caesar through the woods and the morasses, the plains and the mountains of Gaul, they can try to see as through a haze the developed Latin civilization of to-day. If the *raison d'être* of classical study depends largely on its power to develop the historic sense and to pass on to the younger generation the great traditions of the race, then we might argue that there should be no point in the Latin or Greek curriculum where this fundamental aim is consistently ignored. Whether it be at the elementary language stage or in the interpretation of texts, the lesson can be learned, that the history, the culture and the psychology of the Greeks and the Romans are reflected in their language as well as in their literary and artistic creations.

Among the primary facts and concepts to which I have referred are these: that the conquest of Gaul marks the successful struggle of the great Roman civilization with its superb military and administrative machinery against the semibarbarous tribes of western Europe; that Cis-Alpine Gaul is roughly Northern Italy, while Transalpine Gaul is France and Belgium where French is spoken; that the Provincia (Gallia Narbonensis) was established about 120 B.C. nearly three quarters of a century before Caesar's conquest was completed; that the Provincia received an earlier Roman civilization on top of a Greek culture of 500 years standing (the latter itself rested on a previous native Ligurian base); that the Latin of the Provincia survived in the Provençal language, which exhibits a development in many points different from that of French; that the three districts of Caesar's Gaul "differing in language, institutions and laws", although they represent that part of France where French developed, retain to-day some local linguistic peculiarities, just as they did a thousand years ago before the idiom

¹ This paper was read at the Sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Philadelphia, May 4, 1912.

² This paper will appear in the next number of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

³ Among the useful books which outline the history of the informal spoken Latin of the imperial provinces the following may be mentioned: C. H. Grandgent, *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (Boston, 1907), reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2.60-62; E. Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane* (Paris, 1910); A. Zauner, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1905); W. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in das Studium der Romanischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Heidelberg, 1909). In the several Historical French Grammars (Darmsteter, Nerop, etc.) many students will find ample material for illustration. Brachet and Toynbee, *Historical French Grammar* (Oxford, 1896), although it is in some respects antiquated, will be found very stimulating because of the method of presentation.

of the Ile de France won the day as the official language of the realm; that the Celtic race and language still persist in Armorica and Bretagne; that the ancient Celtic language, which contributed Gallic words to the dignified vocabulary of Cicero and Caesar, also contributed words to the speech of the common people of Rome; that this Celtic speech must have affected very much the Latin of the somewhat isolated Roman settlers in Northern Gaul; and that the native Celts must have at first spoken Latin with a brogue.

A bright pupil in reading Caesar will ask: What was the outcome of the Gallic War? What did the Romans do in Gaul? Where did the settlers come from? How did they introduce their civilization there? How did the Romans make the Celts learn Latin? Did the Celts speak Latin and Celtic side by side? Why did not Caesar say that Gaul was divided into five parts? Why do the French cathedral towns of the North have names derived from Gallic tribes (compare *Rheims* with *Remi*), while in the South the names of such cathedral towns are from Latin names of *towns*? Why is a language developed from Latin not spoken to-day in Britain? What is French? a mongrel speech? How does the Latin element in English differ from that in the old spoken French?

Many such queries are answered in the editions of Caesar usually studied. Others can be more wisely suggested and answered in class. While young pupils are not to be inducted into the mysteries of linguistics, I believe that many of them can with profit gain some of the more fundamental concepts, which for practical purposes are ignored in our text-books. For instance, I do not believe that it is necessary for a boy to wait until he is in College to learn that French is a modern development from a spoken, not a written, Latin. On the contrary, I believe that such a knowledge added to his stock of working ideas will serve to stimulate his interest in a hard study. What we call Modern French is a later development from an Old French, the language of Central and Northern France before the twelfth century. In later times this language has undergone a process of standardization. It is distinct from its neighbor the Provençal, the idiom of the South, of Roman Provincia at the mouth of the Rhone. Now, inasmuch as both Old French and Provençal are natural developments from the Latin spoken in Gaul, it follows that their different development must have taken place under different conditions, such as difference of native population, time, method and thoroughness of Romanization, closeness of contact with Italy, and the like. Such external conditions produce what are called the external changes in a language. What are known as internal changes, i.e. changes evolved owing to the internal laws of the language

itself, may be retarded or accelerated, but they are almost inevitable. Such internal changes in spoken Latin would take place in the Latin of both the North and the South of Gaul, and would be common to the spoken Latin throughout the whole Romance domain.

Let us for the sake of clearness begin with Gaul before the Roman invasion. Although the ethnology of Gaul is, in detail, an almost hopeless tangle, the main facts are these¹.

A mixed race called Ligurians, akin to the ancient inhabitants of the Italian Riviera, occupied the region between the Alps and the Rhone to the Mediterranean and doubtless spread in a thinner fringe towards the Pyrennees. About 600 B.C. a Greek colony was founded at Massilia (Marseilles), and a thriving Greek civilization rapidly spread along the charming French Riviera. About 120 B.C. the Romans organized their Provincia (Gallia Narbonensis), which later became so thoroughly Romanized that it was spreading a definite literary and cultural influence even on Italy itself, at a time when most of Celtic Gaul was struggling to emerge from semi-barbarism. The commercial and official intercourse between Provincia and the parent country was close and continuous. Under these favorable external conditions, therefore, there developed a spoken Latin which survived in Provençal, and which, beside the great mass of phenomena common to it and the language of Northern Gaul, exhibits, as one might expect, other peculiarities possessed in common with the Latin of the Northern part of the Italian peninsula on the East, and the Spanish peninsula on the West. In the main, Provençal strongly resembles the early form of the older and southern Romance languages.

The southwest part of Gaul, what roughly corresponds to Caesar's Aquitania, and the region between the Rhone and the Pyrennees had been inhabited originally by a people who spoke a language akin to the Basque. They were driven out by a people whom we may call Iberians; but doubtless descendants of this Basque folk survived among the Iberian population. The latter also mingled with the fringe of Ligurians who had spread beyond the Rhone. Next, after the invasion of Celtic conquerors, a Celtic language and civilization were superimposed upon this Basque-Iberian domain.

To what race the palaeolithic and neolithic peoples who originally dwelt in Central Gaul belonged we cannot determine. Celtic speaking invaders entered Gaul in the seventh century B.C. and settled the country of the Iberians and the Ligurians. "The people who called themselves Celtae were very much mixed. They comprised descendants of palaeolithic and neolithic races, and the latest comers, the con-

¹They may be found on pages 257-338 of T. Rice Holmes's *Conquest of Gaul*, a book that should be consulted by every teacher of Caesar. See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 6.29-31.

quering Celtic speaking Gauls, were those who gave the name to the entire group".

The same condition must have obtained in Belgic Gaul. The conquering people was of the same Celtic stock, which had dwelt long near the Germanic tribes beyond the Rhine, and it is not improbable that in the veins of the Belgae flowed some Germanic blood.

Now the conquest of the semibarbarous tribes was not begun until about half a century after the Provincia had been Romanized, and the series of wars required to reduce them thoroughly to subjection dragged on for nearly half a century longer. As fast as a region was pacified, Roman trade, language and government were introduced in the important centers of population. To these centers and the regions nearby there were *deductiones* or transfers of Italian colonists and old soldiers who spoke the living Latin of Italy; from these henceforth radiated the Roman influences. The Elder Pliny (N. H. 3.4) called the region *Italia verius quam provincia*. The old tribal constitutions were rapidly supplanted by the Roman form of municipal government. The Roman coinage and Roman measures were imposed upon the people. In Northern Gaul certain concessions were granted to the people, but a Roman colony was given to each district as an administrative and intellectual center, where Roman speech and customs exclusively prevailed. For example, the Northern Gauls retained the Celtic measures of distance beside the Roman: hence the Celtic word *leuca* has been preserved in the French *lieue* (league) beside the Latin *millia*. According to Mommsen, the great difference in the mode of administration between Provence and the rest of Gaul was under the senatorial rather than under the imperial rule, and was the cause more than anything else that produced the still persisting diversity in language and customs between the country of the south and the north of France.

The Aquitanians were conquered in 56 B.C. by P. Licinius Crassus, but their definite submission is marked by the triumph of M. Valerius Messala in 27 B.C. Being a commercial people and less warlike than the Gauls generally, they more readily succumbed to Roman rule, but even at the time of Strabo the native language was still being spoken.

Central Gaul was subdued after the proverbial Roman method of *divide et impera*, yet as fast as districts were pacified they were welded together. Local cantonal constitutions were respected; a kind of representation was allowed; by means of schools and colleges the power of the local priesthood was undermined; and the Roman civilization gradually intruded among them. Even as late as the third century after Christ the Gallic speech continued, as is proved by a passage of Ulpian, which says that testaments might be drawn *non solum Latina vel*

Graeca lingua sed etiam Punica vel Gallicana vel alterius cuiusque gentis. In the more remote regions of Gaul, as in Bretagne, where the Romanization was only superficial, Celtic has persisted to this day: but the Celtic element was reinforced in the fifth century by immigration from Cornwall when the Romans abandoned Britain.

From all that has been said it must be clear, as indeed one would have expected, that in the fifth century Roman civilization was universal in Gaul. Latin was spoken generally not merely as the official language of the courts but as a provincial idiom, although in the north the native idioms were still alive. Now as the Roman civilization of the South had been superimposed *at an earlier period* and on a *different mixture of races*, it would be a natural supposition, that the quality of the Latin spoken there must have been in some respects different from that of the Latin spoken in the North. And everything points to this as being true, although materials are lacking for a satisfactory reconstruction of the respective forms of Gallic Latin.

What might be called the Gallic Latin period during which Vulgar Latin according to Roman usage was gradually winning ascendancy over the national idioms may be dated from 120 B.C. to 476 A.D. in the South and from 20 B.C. to 476 A.D. in the North. What Darmsteter terms the Gallo-roman period (i.e. the transition from a Gallic Latin to what must have been substantially the base of the modern Romanic idioms of France) may be put from the end of the fifth century to 842, the beginning of our written Romance documents in Gaul.

The period of Gallic Latin we have assumed to end approximately with the fall of the Western Roman empire in 476. The invasion of the Germanic and other barbarous tribes swept westward over Gaul and Spain, and after several tumultuous centuries, during which various Gallic districts maintained a precarious independence, the Germanic peoples of the Burgundians and Visigoths gained control in the South, and the Franks in the North. The effect of this new linguistic stratum on the old is hard to estimate exactly, partly because we know so little about the precise aspect of the Gallic Latin in the sixth century, and partly because we know so little about the exact form of speech of the Germanic conquerors.

However, it is an interesting fact that the German words taken over into the Gallic speech during these centuries show, some of them, that they were taken over early, since they have been affected by the phonetic laws of the Gallic Latin, while others, introduced later, have not been assimilated, or even much changed.

In general it is in the language of the North of Gaul that we find the greatest number of words of Germanic origin. The fact remains that the

Germanic influence has been relatively slight. The subsequent development of the national Franco-Gallic idiom followed largely the laws of internal change inherent in the Gallic Latin.

The Romanic idiom, which is found in the earliest documents in Northern Gaul in the ninth century, appears in five or more dialects in fairly well defined regions, e.g. Norman in the Northwest, Picardian in the Northeast. That spoken in the Ile de France, about Paris, ended by supplanting all the others, becoming French. The idiom of Northern France was, in the middle ages, known as the *langue d'oïl*, i.e. that in which an original *hoc illud* was used for 'yes'. The idiom of the South was the *langue d'oc*, or that in which an original Latin *hoc* was so used. The earliest written documents of the *langue d'oc* exhibit, as does the language of the North, various dialects. From the beginning of the twelfth century there developed among them a classic, literary form, Provençal, used for the lyric poems of the Troubadours. From the close of the fourteenth century French became little by little the official idiom of the South as well as of the North of Gaul.

The special aim of this paper is to attempt some sort of a brief characterization of the Latin spoken in Gaul during the latter part of the Gallic Latin period. As the later dual development of Gallic Latin has followed geographic and racial lines, it is fair to assume that the latter are largely responsible for the external changes which gave to French and Provençal their different forms.

Internal changes are, as I have said, those evolved according to the laws of the language itself. For example, *ns* in Vulgar Latin after a vowel had a tendency to be reduced to *s* (compare *consul*, *cosul*); the process was arrested in the formal classical written Latin, though not in the popular speech. So too the change of *vowel quantity* to *vowel quality* was an internal change, and is common to all the Romance languages.

External changes are such as were introduced into the language by contact with non-Latin peoples. Thus the nasalization of the vowels in French is thought by some scholars to have been due to Celtic influence. Again, native accent is a most potent factor in effecting external changes. The dropping of certain intervocalic consonants, the slurring of unaccented syllables, and the diphthongization of certain accented vowels result from local habits of accent or pronunciation. What is most surprising is the relatively small number of Celticisms which can be traced in the Gallic Latin. This is probably because the difference between the Latin and the old Celtic phonology was relatively slight, and the process of Roman assimilation was so thorough and rapid.

The effect of external change may be illustrated

by the following typical example. The Gallic Latin word for 'to sing' was *cantāre*. The Provençal form was *cantār*. But in Northern Gaul there was a tendency to palatalize the guttural. Initial *c* before *a* became *ch*. Also there was a tendency to pronounce *a* in *āre* as a long open *e* (ē): hence was evolved the Old French *chantēr* (New French *chanter*). So Gallic Latin *cabāllus*, 'horse', remained *cavāl* in Provençal, but became *cheval* in the North. So *gamba*, 'leg', remained *gamba* in Provençal, but became Old French *jame*, New French *jambe*, in the North. In the late Gallic Latin period these changes were becoming more marked, but, owing to lack of direct evidence, it is hard to tell just how far the processes had advanced. Languages do not change suddenly.

Our sources for a characterization of Gallic Latin are the Latin inscriptions of Gaul, the notices of the grammarians, glosses (such as the Kessel and Reichenau glosses), early manuscript corruptions, Gallo-Roman writers, Old French and Provençal, ancient Celtic borrowings from the Gallic Latin, Gallic Latin borrowings of Celtic words, and Latinization of place-names and the like. From such data it is hard to generalize.

Old Celtic was harsh and raspy. Claudian (Carm. Min. 1.8, De Mulabus Gallicis) states that the muleteers used Celtic words with which to goad on their animals: *frenorumque vicem lingua virilis agit . . . miraris, si voce feras pacaverat Orpheus, cum pronas pecudes Gallica verba regant*.

Windisch (pp. 301 ff.) declares that Celtic and Latin are so similar in their phonology, that at the time of the Romanization of Gaul the Gallic influence was not able to work havoc with the Latin consonants. The old Celtic lacked *h* and *f*; *p* had disappeared; and initial *st* and probably *sp* were not used. Moreover, the vocalism of the old Gallic stood only at an older stage than that of the Latin. The many similarities in the phonology, morphology, and vocabulary (for beside loan-words there were many cognate equivalents in the Latin) may account for the quick adoption of the Roman speech in Gaul.

The Gallic accent of Latin dissyllables seems to have been on the ultima. The grammarian Vergilius Maro of Toulouse says: *rectum esse sentimus, quod non minus reperiemus secundos pedes elevari quam primos*; compare e.g. *egó, amá, audí, sedés, regés*. This, says Groeber, reminds us of the French method of accentuation and the mediaeval pronunciation of Latin in France.

A study of the changes which certain place names have undergone shows that the old Celtic accent was prevailingly recessive. In Tibullus 1.7.

11 *Carnútes* is seen to have a long penult, yet the French Chartres points to a *Carnútes*. So *Nannútes*, whose penult is transliterated in Greek by an eta,

became *Nánnētes*, whence Nantes. So *Nemāūsus* > *Némaūsus* > Nîmes; and *Tricāsses* > Tricasses > Troyes. This last accentuation is attested by the rhythmic clausula in Ammianus Marcellinus. On the other hand some earlier short penults became accented: Compare *Bellóvāci* > *Bellovāci* > Beauvais. All place names in *-ācum* and *-ācum* were so accented.

Celtic influence on the Gallic phonology is claimed for the following:

(1) The pronunciation *ū* as *ü*, as is prevalent today in France, Northern Portugal, in some parts of Northern Italy and in Western Raetia, is still regarded by some scholars as having been the result of Celtic influence, but the claim is denied by others.

(2) The nasalization of vowels, which has become so thoroughly characteristic of the French, occurs only where Celtic influence appears: Compare e.g. *rationem* > Fr. *raison*, Port. *razaô*; *bonum* > Fr. *bon*, Port. *bô*.

(3) Thurneysen assigns to Celtic influence the tendency of the Gallic Latin to diphthongize Lat. *ē* to *oi*: Compare e.g. *rēgem* > *roi*; *legem* > *loi*.

(4) The loss of intervocalic, *t, d, g*: Compare e.g. *Augústum* > *août*; *audire* > *ouïr*; *lēgere* > *lire*.

(5) The Latin combination *-ct-* acts similarly in France and Northern Portugal. The phenomenon is the same as that of the Celtic *ct* becoming *it* through a *-cht-*: compare e.g. Lat. *lāctem* > Gallic Latin *lachte* > Fr. *lait*.

Very little is known of the effect of the Celtic on the Gallic Latin inflections. The nominative in *-os* is common on Gallic inscriptions alongside of *-us*.

One instance of the Celtic influence on Gallic Latin syntax may be the use of the preposition *ad* (Fr. *à*) even nowadays to indicate possession. Thurneysen (Archiv 7. 523) affirms that the use of *inter* to express a reciprocal relation is peculiar to the French dialects and that this Latin preposition was called into service to make up for the want of a preposition corresponding in function to a native Celtic preposition equivalent to the Latin *ambi*. Geyer (Archiv 8. 482) cites from the old Salic Formulae *inter nos interdonare* where *interdonare* is shown to be Vulgar Latin by the many attempts to avoid it by circumlocution.

Brunot notes that the French say *c'est moi qui*, *c'est toi qui*, but that this is not Latin. In some Celtic dialects the verb is conjugated by means of this periphrase.

There are many peculiarities of the Gallic Latin syntax as found on inscriptions and in the late Gallic Latin writers but they are not always demonstrably of Celtic origin.

The number of Celtic words which came into the Gallic Latin vocabulary must have been considerable in the early period. About a hundred are thought to have been preserved in French. Some

are certainly Celtic and have Gallic Latin corroboration: compare e.g. *alauda* > *alouette*. Other Celtic words came into Latin before the Latin was taken from Italy to Gaul. Some non-Latin words in French are probably Celtic, others only suspected to be so.

The Gallic inscriptions published by Pirson show that Gallic Latin preserved in this form is not very different from what the Latin of Italy of the same class must have been at the same time. The study by Groeber in the early volumes of the Archiv of the stock of Vulgar Latin words preserved in the several Romance Languages reveals something like a hundred Vulgar Latin words which survived in the Latin of Gaul alone. These must therefore be considered to have had a peculiarly strong hold in Gaul. For example: elsewhere the word for house is *casa*, in Gaul it was *mansio* (Fr. *maison*); *casa* does not appear in the Gallic Latin, but the form *casus* survives in the preposition *chez*.

Again, a study of the style of the Gallo-Roman writers—Marcellus Empiricus, Sulpicius Severus, Sidonius Apollinaris, Salvianus, and Gregory of Tours—shows similar lexicographical peculiarities. Marcellus and Sidonius use *carminare* (Fr. *charmer*), which is Gallic Latin; in Italian and Spanish Latin the word used was *incantare*.

Furthermore, within the Gallic province itself some different forms were favored. In Gaul *piscio* (*poisson*) and *messio* (*moisson*) were used, elsewhere *piscis* and *messis*. In the North of Gaul often a different form was current from that found in the South: e.g. in the North we find *nivicare*; in the South *nivare*. Similarly we find *strenna* and *strena*. Pages 311-399 of Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane*, give many examples of the different changes and uses in the course of the dual development of the Vulgar Latin in Gaul.

UNION COLLEGE.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

REVIEW

Marcus Tullius Cicero: Seven Orations, with Selections from the Letters, De Senectute, and Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Grammatical Appendix, and Prose Composition, by Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley. New York: Silver, Burdett & Company (1912). Pp. xlii + 501.

This book is like the edition of Caesar by the same authors, in that it is designed to be a complete text-book for the year. Its general appearance is prepossessing and it contains an exceptionally large number of excellent illustrations. Many of the grammatical statements, also, are notably clear and concise, but the book, as a whole, is so full of major and minor blemishes that it is hard to see how it can prove very satisfactory to a scholarly and conscientious teacher.